

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are pending.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0066085 A1 to Boyer et al. (hereinafter, "Boyer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,619,249 to Billock et al. (hereinafter, "Billock"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,583,560 to Florin et al. (hereinafter, "Florin") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method of displaying recently accessed television channels comprising "generating a primary display screen having multiple small display screens, each small display screen corresponding to one of the selected channels", and "displaying the primary display screen on a television through a web browser program."

Boyer, Billock, and/or Florin do not teach or suggest displaying the primary display screen (of the selected television channels) on a television through a Web browser program, as recited by the combination of elements in claim 1.

Boyer simply describes that television program information, such as television program guide data, is provided as Web pages in an HTTP format (*Boyer* ¶0068 and ¶0072). Further, the television program guide may be accessed using a standard Web browser (*Boyer* ¶0073). The Office relies on these sections

1 of Boyer (e.g., ¶¶ 0068, 0072-73), and that Boyer describes video clips as
2 television program information (*Office Action* p.2). Boyer further describes that a
3 Web browser supports viewing video clips (*Boyer* ¶0073).

4 However, the television program information described in Boyer, including
5 the video clips, are contained in a media library of a computer system -- these are
6 not television channels (*Boyer* ¶¶ 0065-66). Boyer does not disclose or even
7 suggest that television channels are displayed in a primary display screen on a
8 television through a Web browser program, as recited in claim 1. Boyer describes
9 that televisions 108, 112, and 120 shown in Fig. 3 all receive a television signal
10 110, 114, and 118, respectively (*Boyer*, ¶¶ 0069-71). There is no discussion or
11 indication that any of these television signals are displayed on a television through
12 a Web browser program, as Applicant claims.

13 Further, the Office recognizes that neither Boyer nor Billock disclose small
14 display screens corresponding to a selected channel (*Office Action* p.3).
15 Accordingly, Boyer and/or Billock do not disclose a television channel displayed
16 in the primary display screen, as recited in claim 1. Additionally, the Office has
17 previously recognized that Florin does not disclose "displaying the primary
18 display screen on a television through a web browser program", as recited in
19 claim 1 (*Office Action* dated April 21, 2003 p.2).

20 Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-5 and 7-19 are
21 allowable over the Boyer-Billock-Florin combination and Applicant respectfully
22 requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

23
24 The Office continues to cite references that describe Web-based
25 information (e.g., HTML frames and/or Web sites) being displayed with a Web

1 browser application on a computer display. Furthermore, this being the
2 Applicant's sixth response to the fifth different combination of references cited to
3 reject claim 1, it is apparent that the Office is using hindsight reconstruction to
4 pick and choose among isolated references to substantiate a rejection. This
5 practice has been held to be impermissible. The teaching or suggestion to make a
6 claimed combination *and* the reasonable expectation of success must both be
7 found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure (MPEP §2142).

8 To date, the Office has cited Florin in combination with seven other
9 references, yet not a single reference of record, or the seven combinations of the
10 references, even suggests that television channels are displayed in a primary
11 display screen on a television through a web browser program, as recited in
12 claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject
13 application.

14
15 Claims 20, 26, and 34-35 recite similar features of displaying the primary
16 display screen through a web browser program, the primary display screen having
17 small display screens that correspond to selected channels. For the reasons
18 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claims 20, 26, and
19 34-35 are allowable over the Boyer-Billock-Florin combination and Applicant
20 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

21 In addition, claims 21-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
22 claim 20 (either directly or indirectly), and claims 27-28 are allowable by virtue of
23 their dependency upon claim 26.
24
25

1 Claim 29 recites a primary display screen displayed through an interactive
2 display environment including World Wide Web content, and the primary display
3 screen having small display screens that each correspond to a selected channel.
4 For the reasons described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1,
5 claim 29 along with dependent claims 31-32 are allowable over the Boyer-Billock-
6 Florin combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be
7 withdrawn.

8
9 Claim 33 recites displaying the primary display screen on a television
10 through a web browser program, and the primary display screen having small
11 display screens each corresponding to a selected channel. For the reasons
12 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 33 is allowable
13 over the Boyer-Billock-Florin combination and Applicant respectfully requests
14 that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

15
16 Claim 36 recites the primary display screen being displayed through a web
17 browser program, and the primary display screen having small display screens
18 each corresponding to a selected channel. For the reasons described above in the
19 response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 36 is allowable over the Boyer-Billock-
20 Florin combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be
21 withdrawn.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Feb 9, 2004By: 

David A. Morasch
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210